

To: Yamada, Richard (Yujiro)[yamada.richard@epa.gov]
Cc: Beck, Nancy[Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]
From: Bowman, Liz
Sent: Wed 10/25/2017 5:43:09 PM
Subject: FW: checking in on science, and other fronts

Nancy, ignore my last email – Richard, can you provide more information here?

From: Beck, Nancy
Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2017 8:35 PM
To: Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>
Cc: Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>; Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: checking in on science, and other fronts

Chloroprene is all being driven by an IRIS value (ORD) and then the way it is used in NATA (air program) leading to alarm about health risks, as predicted by IRIS.

NATA used to be well caveated but I think much of that language was removed in the last administration.

Richard should be able to assist.

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP
P: [202-564-1273](tel:202-564-1273)
M: [202-731-9910](tel:202-731-9910)
Beck.Nancy@epa.gov

On Oct 24, 2017, at 8:31 PM, Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov> wrote:

Nancy, is the first highlighted section under your jurisdiction? If so, can you help Liz?
Thanks!

Erik Baptist

Senior Deputy General Counsel

Office of General Counsel

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20460

(202) 564-1689

baptist.erik@epa.gov

From: Bowman, Liz

Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2017 6:52 PM

To: Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>; Schwab, Justin <Schwab.Justin@epa.gov>; Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: checking in on science, and other fronts

Can you guys help with the highlighted?

From: Eilperin, Juliet [<mailto:Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2017 11:19 AM

To: Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>; Dennis, Brady <Brady.Dennis@washpost.com>

Subject: checking in on science, and other fronts

Dear Liz,

We just wanted to check in with you on a few different fronts, we are sure you've got a lot on your plate.

1. We've heard the new scientific advisory appointments are coming out tomorrow. Have you sorted out whether we can talk to anyone in advance on it? And more broadly, is there someone who would be able to speak about what's happening in terms of the agency's broader approach to science?

2. Is there anyone available to discuss what the agency is thinking of doing about the regulation of the production of chloroprene at a Louisiana plant—there is a request from its manufacturer, Denka, to revisit the scientific conclusions the agency had reached about it back in 2010 through the Integrated Risk Information System, and then the House Science Committee Chairman Lamar Smith and a top subcommittee chairman wrote Administrator Pruitt about this topic earlier this month.

3. Is anyone going to be able to get back to us on the question we asked yesterday about a broader policy concerning EPA presentations at conferences, is that under John's portfolio?

4. And finally, on the glider rule I wrote about yesterday, you'll recall that when Administrator Pruitt spoke about this issue in August, he referred to the need to assess both EPA's legal authority to regulate these components under the CAA, and recent technical data. In terms of data, was he referring to the finding from Tennessee Tech that were submitted to EPA as part of Fitzgerald Truck Sales' petition for reconsideration of the rule?

Thanks, and again, we know these questions span a number of fronts, so we just wanted to put them on your radar screen sooner rather than later.

Juliet

Juliet Eilperin

Senior National Affairs Correspondent

Washington Post

Juliet.eilperin@washpost.com

(O) 202-334-7774

(C) 202-302-3663

@eilperin